

REMARKS

Claims 1-78 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 7-10, 17-20, 26-29, 35-38, 44-47, 55-58, 65-68, 75 and 77 being the independent claims. In summary of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-38, 40-49, 51-59, 61-69 and 71-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322 B1 (Wood et al.) and claims 2, 11, 21, 30, 39, 50, 60 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Wood et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 B1 (Gupta et al.).

Acknowledgement of the drawings as formal and Applicant's domestic priority claim is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections to the claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-38, 40-49, 51-59, 61-69 and 71-78 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322 B1 (Wood et al., hereinafter Wood).

Claims 1, 3-9, 38, 40-49, 51-57, and 75-78

Regarding claim 1, the claim language states "receiving a first request from a user for an application instance, the request including a single identifier for all user requests *without further user and session application variables...*" (emphasis added). The Office Action contends that this element is described by Wood, correlating the "session id" of Wood to the "single identifier" of claim 1. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to address the additional language of claim 1 requiring that the request include a single identifier "without further user and session application variables." In fact, in col. 8, lines 9-12, Wood describes that there are additional user session and application variables, namely, "a principal id, a trust level, group ids, a creation time, and expiration time." Therefore, this limitation is not taught or suggested by Wood.

Since all the limitations of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by Wood, Wood does not anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus earnestly solicited.

Claims 3-9, 38, 40-49, 51-57, and 75-78 either depend from claim 1 or were rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 with respect to the claim 1 element discussed above and, therefore, are not anticipated by Wood for the same reason. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Claims 10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-37, 58, 59, 61-69, and 71-74

Regarding claim 10, the claim language states “transmitting *an application instance response* to the user...” (emphasis added). The Office Action contends that this is described in Wood in col. 8, lines 13-25, col. 19, lines 33-34 and other sections. However, in these sections cited by the Office Action, Wood merely describes authentication of a user. For example, Wood states, “...if authentication was successful, session credentials are returned to application security framework.” Col. 19, lines 43-45. Applicant respectfully submits “session credentials” does not describe an “application instance” and “security framework” is not descriptive of a “user.” An “application instance” refers to the services and/or information the user has requested. This differs from “session credentials” in that these credentials are used for authentication of the user, not services the user requests. Also, a “user” is one who makes a request for the services, as opposed to a “security framework,” which is a system for processing the authentication of a user. Therefore, Wood does not teach or suggest “transmitting an application instance response to the user...” as stated in claim 10.

Since all the limitations of claim 10 are not taught or suggested by Wood, Wood does not anticipate claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus earnestly solicited.

Claims 10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-37, 58, 59, 61-69, and 71-74 either depend from claim 10 or were rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 with respect to the claim 10 element discussed above and, therefore, are not anticipated by Wood for the same reason. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections for these claims is earnestly solicited.

DOCKET NO.: IVGP-0005
Application No.: 09/812,634
Office Action Dated: August 24, 2004

PATENT

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103


Claims 2, 11, 21, 30, 39, 50, 60 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322 B1 (Wood) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,752 B1 (Gupta et al., hereinafter Gupta).

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” MPEP § 2142. Since claims 2, 11, 21, 30, 39, 50, 60 and 70 all depend from one of claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-38, 40-49, 51-59, 61-69 and 71-78, they all include the limitations of the particular claim from which each depends. Therefore, all the limitations of claims 2, 11, 21, 30, 39, 50, 60 and 70 are not taught or suggested by Wood as explained above with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 22-29, 31-38, 40-49, 51-59, 61-69 and 71-78. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for claims 2, 11, 21, 30, 39, 50, 60 and 70 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each point raised by the Examiner in the office action and Applicants submit that claims 1-78 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 23, 2004



Jeremiah J. Baunach
Registration No. 44,527

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439